

MAR 26 2007

Application No: 10/084,712
Attorney's Docket No: US020056**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR 1.116 since the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance (for the reasons discussed herein); (b) do not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration (because the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout the prosecution); (c) satisfy a requirement of form asserted in the previous Office Action; (d) do not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims; and (e) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The amendments are necessary and were not earlier presented because they address informalities first raised in the January 26, 2007, Office Action. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6, 8, 9, 11, 13-17, 20 and 21 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 9, 20 and 21 are independent. Claims 7, 10, 12, 18 and 19 were previously cancelled without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter recited therein. Claims 1, 9, 16, 20 and 21 are amended.

The amendments to claims 1, 9, 16, 20 and 21 are made to address minor matters of form, and to place the claims in better condition for appeal. It is respectfully submitted that none of the amendments to claims 1, 9, 16, 20 and 21 presents subject matter requiring further search and/or consideration. Thus, in addition to the reasons previously stated, entry of the amendment is respectfully requested.

Application No: 10/084,712
Attorney's Docket No: US020056

In section 13 at the bottom of page 6, the Office Action objects to claims 9 and 20 for the specified reasons. Regarding the objection to claim 20, the claim is amended as suggested by the Office Action. Regarding the objection to claim 9, this objection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that the conjunction identified in the Office Action does belong where it appears in claim 9. Applicant believes a minor point of confusion may have been caused because claim 9 recites a method comprising certain steps and one of the steps includes three sub-steps. Applicant has attempted to make this clear in the amended version of claim 9 presented in the Amendment filed on October 11, 2006, by double indenting the elements that are sub-steps of the third and final step in the method, namely the steps of displaying the information.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that the objections to claims 9 and 20 in section 13 on page 6 of the Office Action be withdrawn.

In section 15 on page 7, the Office Action rejects claims 1, 16 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for the specified reasons. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 16 is amended to comply with the requirements of antecedent basis. It is respectfully submitted that claim 16 complies with those requirements.

Claims 1 and 20 are amended to introduce an episode of a television program. It is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 20 are definite. Claims 9 and 21 are amended in the same manner.

Application No: 10/084,712
Attorney's Docket No: US020056

Regarding the issue of a narrow range within a broad range, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Examiner has misapplied the standard. In particular, Applicant notes that the steps of connecting and processing relate to the information, while the summaries relate to the step of combining, which is included in the step of processing. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the recitations of information and summaries in claims 1 and 20 are clear and definite.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1, 16 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

In section 17 on pages 8-12, the Office Action rejects claims 1-5, 8-11, 13-16, 20 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,756,997 to Ward III et al. (hereinafter "Ward") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,263,507 to Ahmad. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As a preliminary matter, Applicant notes that claims 11 and 13-16 are excluded from the statement of the rejection in the first paragraph of section 17 on page 8 of the Office Action. However, claims 11 and 13-16 are addressed in the body of the rejection on pages 11-12 of the Office Action. Further, the Office Action Summary indicates that claims 11 and 13-16 are rejected. Claims 11 and 13-16 are not mentioned in any of the other rejections in the Office Action. Therefore, Applicant believes it is clear that the Office Action intended to list claims 11 and 13-16 as being included in this rejection.

Regarding claim 1, the Office Action responds to Applicant's previously submitted arguments in section 11 on pages 3-4. The Office Action correctly identifies two arguments made

Application No: 10/084,712
Attorney's Docket No: US020056

by the Applicant in the previous response. However, in responding to the first of the two arguments, the Office Action appears to completely overlook the fact that Applicant's first argument focused on the recitation in claim 1 of "summaries." Instead of addressing this subject matter recited in claim 1, the Office Action's response to this argument focuses on the definition of an episode. Thus, the Office Action's response to Applicant's first and second arguments are essentially a response only to Applicant's second argument (i.e., the Office Action is non-responsive to Applicant's first argument). The Office is expected to respond. Otherwise, Applicant's rebuttal has not been addressed by the Office and the finality of this rejection is deemed to be reversible as a matter of law.

Claims 2-5 and 8 are allowable based at least on their dependence from claim 1 for the reasons stated above in connection with claim 1, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter recited therein.

On pages 11-12, the Office Action relies solely on the previously discussed issues in connection with claims 1-5 with respect to claims 11 and 13-16. Thus, claims 11 and 13-16 are also allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Regarding independent claim 20, the Office Action relies on arguments previously discussed in connection with claim 1. Thus, claim 20 is allowable also for the foregoing reasons.

Claim 21 also recites episodes. As previously described, the Office Action relies on disclosure in the prior art relating to news. Thus, claim 21 is also allowable for reasons discussed above.

Application No: 10/084,712
Attorney's Docket No: US020056

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1-5, 8-11, 13-16, 20 and 21 as allegedly being unpatentable over Ward in view of Ahmad be withdrawn.

In section 18 on pages 12-13, the Office Action rejects claims 6 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ward in view of Ahmad and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,240,555 to Shoff et al. (hereinafter "Shoff"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 6 and 17 are allowable based at least on their dependency from claims 1 and 21, respectively, for at least the reasons stated above in connection with the rejection of claims 1 and 21. Shoff fails to overcome the deficiencies in Ahmad and Ward described above.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 6 and 17 as allegedly being unpatentable over Ward in view of Ahmad and further in view of Shoff be withdrawn.

In section 19 on pages 13-14, the Office Action rejects claim 9 as being unpatentable over Ward in view of Shoff. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 9 recited episodes. Ward is deficient with respect to this subject matter recited in claim 9 for the reasons stated above in connection with the rejection of independent claims 1 and 21. Shoff fails to overcome the deficiencies in Ahmad and Ward described above.

Further, in the paragraphs bridging pages 4 and 5, the Office Action responds to Applicant's previously submitted arguments with respect to claim 9. However, the text included in the description column in Figure 3 of Shoff are titles of entire episodes. Because this text corresponds to titles of entire episodes, it cannot be an event "in an episode" as recited in claim 9 (emphasis added).

Application No: 10/084,712
Attorney's Docket No: US020056

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 9 as allegedly being unpatentable over Ward in view of Shoff be withdrawn.

Conclusion

While we believe that the instant amendment places the application in condition for allowance, should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the correspondence attorney listed below in order to expeditiously resolve any outstanding issues.

Application No: 10/084,712
Attorney's Docket No: US020056

In the event that the fees submitted prove to be insufficient in connection with the filing of this paper, please charge our Deposit Account Number 50-0578 and please credit any excess fees to such Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,
KRAMER & AMADO, P.C.



Terry W. Kramer

Registration No.: 41,541

Date: March 26, 2007

KRAMER & AMADO, P.C.
1725 Duke Street, Suite 240
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone: 703-519-9801
Fax: 703-519-9802

DIRECT ALL CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Yan Glickberg – Registration No.: 51,742
US PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
Phone: (914) 333-9618
Fax: (914) 332-0615